

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 4, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 4, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-12, 15-19, 24-35 and 38-43 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12, 15-19, 24-35 and 38-43 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 24, and 43 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 17-19, 24-26, 28-34, 38-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Crawford* (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,176).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Crawford* does not disclose "each and every element as set forth in the claim". For example, *Crawford* does not disclose "invoking a second hover element for display on the display screen after invoking the first hover element, and while the pointer element continues to be positioned over the user interface element." The Examiner argues that *Crawford* discloses this element at Figure 5 generally, with label 510 "Play Multimedia Object" as an alleged example of a second hover element.

However, the multimedia object is not a hover element whose invocation depends on the continued relative positioning of a pointer element over a user interface element. Hover elements are well-known constructs. A hover element (e.g., hover text) is a graphical object that is prompted by the positioning of a pointer over a predefined user interface element. The independent claims specifically recite that the second hover element is invoked responsive to the pointer element continuing to be positioned over the user interface element. Thus, the invocation of the second hover element is dependent on continuity of position, relative to a user interface element. In contrast, the multimedia object in *Crawford* is described as a part of a graphical display element (GDE) in a GUI called a “help window.” See Col. 3 Lines 1-4. A multimedia object (which *Crawford* discloses could be music or video) is invoked if such an object is associated with the help window. Col. 6, lines 28-34. Thus, the multimedia object is nothing more than an attribute of the help window and is not invoked responsive to a pointer element having a continuing position over the user interface element. Stated differently, assuming a multimedia object is associated with the help window of *Crawford*, the multimedia object is invoked in response to the help window being opened irrespective of the relative position of the user interface and the pointer.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and  
**S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,**

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

---

Gero G. McClellan  
Registration No. 44,227  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants